

1  
2                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
3                   **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
4                   **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

5  
6                   **IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)**  
7                   **ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

8  
9                   This Document Relates To:

10                  *Best Buy Co, Inc. v. Technicolor*  
11                  *SA, et al.*, No. 13-cv-05264;

12                  *Siegel v. Technicolor SA, et al.*, No. 13-cv-  
13                  00141;

14                  *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et*  
15                  *al.*, No. 13-cv-05723;

16                  *Electrograph Systems, Inc. v. Technicolor SA,*  
17                  *et al.*, No. 13-cv-05724;

18                  *Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA, et*  
19                  *al.*, No. 13-cv-05727;

20                  *Office Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, et al.*,  
21                  No. 13-cv-05726;

22                  *P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp. v.*  
23                  *Technicolor SA, et al.*, No. 13-cv-05725;

24                  *Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Technicolor SA, et*  
25                  *al.*, No. 13-cv-05262;

26                  *Schultze Agency Services, LLC v. Technicolor*  
27                  *SA, et al.*, No. 13-cv-05668; and

28                  *Target Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et al.*, No. 13-  
cv-05686

Master File No. 3:07-md-05944-SC

MDL No. 1917

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
DIRECT ACTION PLAINTIFFS'  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL  
PORTIONS OF THEIR OPPOSITION TO  
MITSUBISHI'S MOTION TO DISMISS  
PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULES 7-  
11 AND 79-5(d)

1           On January 27, 2014, Plaintiffs Best Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy Purchasing LLC; Best Buy  
 2 Enterprise Services, Inc.; Best Buy Stores, L.P.; BestBuy.com, L.L.C.; Magnolia Hi-Fi, LLC;  
 3 Alfred H. Siegel (as trustee of the Circuit City Stores, Inc. Liquidating Trust); Electrograph  
 4 Systems, Inc.; Electrograph Technologies Corp.; Interbond Corporation of America; Office  
 5 Depot, Inc.; Costco Wholesale Corporation; P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corporation; ABC  
 6 Appliance, Inc.; MARTA Cooperative of America, Inc.; Schultze Agency Services, LLC, (on  
 7 behalf of Tweeter Opco, LLC, and Tweeter Newco, LLC); Sears Roebuck and Co. and Kmart  
 8 Corp.; and Target Corp., (collectively “Plaintiffs”) filed an Administrative Motion to Seal  
 9 Portions of Amended Complaints Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5(d) to file under  
 10 seal the highlighted portions of the following documents:

- 11           • Direct Action Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Mitsubishi’s Motion to Dismiss Complaints  
 12 (“Opposition”)

13           Having read and considered the papers filed and arguments made by counsel, and good  
 14 cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ Administrative Motion to Seal  
 15 Portions of Their Opposition to Mitsubishi’s Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Local Civil Rules 7-  
 16 11 and 79-5(d) is GRANTED.

17

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

19

20 Dated: 2/12/2014



21 Hon. Samuel Conti  
 22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23

24

25

26

27

28